Info-Hams Digest   Thu, 3 Mar 94   Volume 94 : Issue 232

Today's Topics:
                       Anyone using JPS NIR 10?
                        Easy to get 6:1 balun?
                          Hamblaster Update
                    INTERNET -- PACKET gateway!!!
              Medium range point-to-point digital links
                        On-line Repeater Directory
        Probable demise of the online repeater directory project

----

Date: Thu, 3 Mar 1994 02:45:09 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!mvb.saic.com!news.cerf.net!usc!cs.utexas.edu!news.unt.edu!
news.oc.com!NewsWatcher!user@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Anyone using JPS NIR 10?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I have LOTs of ignition noise in the mobile while operating
on HF. Although I've been warned that DSP won't do much
towards knocking down impulse type noise, I've been using
a W9GR homebuilt unit and find that the improvement is
worthwhile.

About the only DSP unit which specifically mentions noise
reduction is the JPS NIR10 (which now had a Rev. 3.0
firmware upgrade). I'd be interested in opinions of
how well the current software works for noise reduction.

I know there was a QST review of the original unit in
(I think) Oct 91, but I don't have that issue here in
Texas (home qth is normally west of here).

Please e-mail or post here.

THANKS & 73's de WB5KXH

     ======== insert usual disclaimers here ============
        Bob Wier, East Texas State U., Commerce, Texas
keeper of the Adobe Photoshop, MC68HC11, ICOM mailing lists
        wier@merlin.etsu.edu (watch for address change)

Date: Thu, 3 Mar 1994 02:31:58 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!mvb.saic.com!news.cerf.net!usc!yeshua.marcam.com!
news.kei.com!news.oc.com!NewsWatcher!user@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Easy to get 6:1 balun?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Having a scanner with a 50 ohm input, I decided to try
a tv antenna (yagi) as a directional antenna. Small snag -
I got a 300 to 75 ohm transmormer, fed it to the 50
ohm input and it seemed to work reasonably well, but
I'd still like to get a better match. Does anyone know
where you can come up with a 300 ohm balanced to 50
ohm unbalanced (coax) transformer which would be good
up to about 1Ghz?

THANKS & 73's de WB5KXH

     ======== insert usual disclaimers here ============
        Bob Wier, East Texas State U., Commerce, Texas
keeper of the Adobe Photoshop, MC68HC11, ICOM mailing lists
        wier@merlin.etsu.edu (watch for address change)

Date: Thu, 3 Mar 1994 14:13:38 GMT
From: amiserv!vpnet!tellab5!jwa@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Hamblaster Update
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

2-15-94

New Developements

1) Adjustable tap/delay Adaptive (LMS) filter

    Last night I received a disk from Will Torgrim N9PEA.
    It contained several adaptive filter, binary files (binary
    files are actually machine language programs that are
    loaded into the Hamblaster).

    The files contain several flavors, if you will, of adaptive
    filters. One filter had 20 taps. (taps are actually delays
    that are used to impliment FIR filters). A second filter had
    30 taps while another had 50 taps.   The three filters also
    had various convergence delays.

    Here is a list

    l20-1   20 taps with a 1 ms delay
    l30-1   30 taps with a 1 ms delay
    l30-2   30 taps with a 2 ms delay
    l50-1   50 taps with a 1 ms delay
    l50-2   50 taps with a 2 ms delay
    l50-4   50 taps with a 4 ms delay

Results:

    The 20-1 filter worked well with AM broadcast. I think
    that SWL's will be interestes in this one. I provided
    good low frequency response with fast adaption time.

    The 30-1 and 30-2 performed about the same and reduced
    some of the low frequencies. While receiving CW the 30-2
    filter, I noticed a loud, more pronounced, click!

    The 50-1, I think, was the best choice for SSB. It reduced
    the low frequencies and provided a nice crisp sound and
    adapted quickly to carriers or CW.   The 50-4 had a very slow
    adaption time and I was able to copy fast CW, however it still
    adapted to continuous carriers. It did have a bug! High
    frequency tones, CW or carriers passed through very loud and
    sometimes cause a squeal. I think an LP filter at the front
    end will correct that problem. There was also a slow changing
    swooshing sound as the filter slowly adapted.   I didn't have
    time to thoroughly test the 50-2.

    I'm sure I'll receive more adaptive filters for further testing
    I'll keep you posted.

     Jack Albert WA9FVP   Fellow Radio Hacker
           Tele (708) 378-6201
     Tellabs Operations, Inc.   FAX (708) 378-6721
     1000 Remington Blvd.   jwa@tellabs.com
     Bolingbrook, IL 60440

Date: 1 Mar 94 10:50:30 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!sdd.hp.com!sgiblab!swrinde!gatech!howland.reston.ans.net!
europa.eng.gtefsd.com!news.uoregon.edu!netnews.nwnet.net!bach.seattleu.edu!quick!
ole!rwing!eskimo!seacat@network.UCSD
Subject: INTERNET -- PACKET gateway!!!
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

wa2ise@netcom.com (Robert Casey) writes:

>In article <CLoxAu.96q@on.bell.ca> ydupont@Qc.Bell.CA writes:
>>
>>I'm new to PACKET and I would like to know if it's possible to
exchange
>>mail between INTERNET and PACKET. Is there a gateway doing that?
What's
>>the procedure?

>This probably should be in an FAQ file.

>There shouldn't be any real problem with mail from Packet TO internet,
>but the problem lies with the internet TO packet direction. Problem
>is to do with FCC rules. No dirty words are allowed on packet, and
>many forms of commercial or business related messages are not allowed
>eighter. Not sure if you can order a pizza by packet, though. :-)

>Basically, this means that someone has to be a moderator and read all
>the mail going to packet. I doubt anyone's got that much time with
>nothing better to do. You could have a computer reject or remove all
>dirty words, but business/commercial related mail would need a human.

While it is possible to do, my question is why? would you want to do it?

After all, Ham radio is just that, Radio! Tieing it into hardlines in
that matter seems to stray from the topic of the hobby. Pointing mainly
at the matter of RADIO to RADIO digital communication. Thats the sport
of things. THink about it.
Just my opinion of course! :)

R.Seacat KB7ZFU/AA

Glenn Elmore (glenne@sad.hp.com) wrote:
:   How do you intend to support even a fraction of the "20% of hams who call
: packet their primary mode" with even *mediocre* performance (never mind
: something competetive with telephone line modems which would stimulate and
: support growth), 50 dB fade margins etc?

If 20% of hams are using packet as their primary mode when (for the
vast majority of them) the support consists of poorly engineered
1200-baud links and 300-baud HF links, doesn't it make sense that
at *least* that 20% would find 56-kbit/s useful? Understand, I'm
not arguing that faster speeds aren't desirable; they are. The
faster the better, within reasonable economic limits. But "fast
enough" is a relative term. It depends on the amount of data you
want to send and the response times you require. And it's like
hard disks: you'll fill a 20 Mbyte disk to capacity or a 500 Mbyte
disk to capacity, depending on which you have. Sure, you'd rather
have 500 Mbytes, but a heck of a lot of useful work gets done on
20 Mbyte disks. Sure, 56 kit/s isn't enough. Neither is
2 Mbit/s. Neither is 100 Mbit/s, because we can *always* fill it
up.

If you are going to insist that a 56-kbit/s network isn't useful,
what are the useage assumptions you are starting from? I bet I
can develop a (practical) set of usage assumptions that show
your proposed network to be unacceptably limited.

I'm not saying I don't agree that a higher speed network is desriable.
I'm just saying that the utility of the network vs. the speed
is purely a matter of degree, and rests on opinions about what
represents usable network capacity, not on hard data.

By the way... where can I buy my Hubmaster system? I *know* where
I can get the 56-kbaud hardware.
--
Jon Bloom KE3Z   jbloom@arrl.org

Date: Thu, 3 Mar 1994 05:13:46 GMT

From: netcomsv!netcom.com!tcj@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: On-line Repeater Directory
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

John Boteler (bote@access3.digex.net) writes:

 > I thought that the whole idea of Conway's database was that net.hams
 > would supply the empirical data, so it would be home-grown. Maybe
 > I'm confused

I interpretated Conway's project more as an effort to liberate the data from
the printed page and get it into a machine-readable format, making it vastly
more useful. If some of the erroneous data in the published directories gets
corrected in the process, so much the better.

 > Having seen the data that is sent to the ARRL, I can confidently say
 > that the effort of Bart Jahnke at the ARRL is minimized, since the
 > regional coordinators must supply the data to the ARRL in a format
 > almost identical to that which appears in the Repeater Directory.
 > The ARRL simply appends the data together and voila! a Repeater
 > Directory.

Interesting point. By this measure, it would seem to me that the volunteers
who have undertaken to keypunch the data (reagardless of their sources) for
Conway's project deserve more credit for their efforts than the League does.

 > I am happy to report that T-MARC is implementing an "ombudsman" to
 > verify the accuracy of its own data. The ombudsman will take the
 > list of repeaters and verify that each one is on the air.

Bravo! Perhaps some of the other coordinating bodies will follow T-MARC's
example. There are a handful of repeaters listed for my area that I've never
heard a peep out of since I bought my first HT in '85. When I hear that there
are long waiting lists in my area for a coordinated pair on 2M or 75cm, I
often wonder if these phantom allocations are preventing someone else from
getting a machine on the air, or whether they are merely bits of dross at the
bottom of the files that nobody has ever bothered to clean up. Any thoughts,
anyone?

 > I still think that accuracy is crucial, since inaccurate data is
 > worse than no data at all. So, why are we still jabbering about
 > this? Don't say nothin, jes do it!

It seems to me that there's a much better chance for input from users
concerning inaacuracies to have an impact on Conway's database than it does
on the existing directories.

Todd, KB6JXT

Date: Wed, 2 Mar 1994 11:09:00 -0500
From: news.acns.nwu.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!
news.byu.edu!yvax.byu.edu!cunyvm!rohvm1!rohvm1.mah48d@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Probable demise of the online repeater directory project
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <tcjCLzBHG.Cx8@netcom.com>, tcj@netcom.com (Todd Jonz) wrote:

> I don't think anyone has yet contested the fact that the *data* iteself is not
> protected by copyright law. Several folks have cited a precendent in which
> the court found in favor of a company that had been sued by a telephone
> company for republishing information from its white pages, even though this
> information included errors that were specifically designed to uncover this
> kind of activity. Given this, I imagine that the League would be hard pressed
> to win a court case, even if it could demonstrate that the *data* had been
> lifted directly from their directory.
>
> So the question remains: exactly how does the *format* of N2JWQ's compilation
> infringe on that of the ARRL directory? It's true that the data items in the
> Directory are a subset of N2JWQ's database, but this doesn't seem like an
> infringement to me since all of these data items could be independently
> verified by just about anybody with an HT. And while I readily recognize that
> the League deserves credit for the resources they devoted to compiling this
> data, I don't believe this *effort* is protected by copyright law either.

Yeah, I don't think we have any basic disagreement here. I gotta dig up
some of the relevant case law, though! Anyhow, part of the problem _may_
well have to do with something Dan Senie, N1JEB, posted:

>>Read the opening pages of the repeater directory. The publication indicates
>>that certain data were obtained by other groups allowing the ARRL to use
>>copyrighted data wwith permission. It would seem that the League has agreed to
>>those groups being able to copyright their lists. I would guess that those
>>groups see it as worthwhile to have their data printed in the repeater
>>directory, and so allow for its use in the publication.

Could well be that part of the agreement by which the ARRL got to use the
other folks' copyrighted material included a requirement to prevent
unauthorized use by others. They _might_ just be doing something they
have to do.

If you do independently verify, or compile, the basic data (as by posting a
request for _original_ repeater information here, and using that for the

directory), and present it in a format different from the ARRL directory, I
don't think you infringe their directory (caveat: I'm not a lawyer).

But if you have the same columns in the same order, with the same
abbreviations and symbols, you're probably infringing their format, under
US copyright law, even if your directory is on-line and not printed. How
close you can come to somebody else's presentation of data and not infringe
is the sort of thing that keeps lawyers driving Beemers.

Maybe we should wait and see if Conway has any success negotiating with the
League. That might be something where ARRL members might have some
influence: e-mail the league (or at least the guys listed in the directory
recently posted) and your director, and urge them to grant permission to
use data/format for an on-line directory.

--
73 de John Taylor   W3ZID
rohvm1.mah48d@rohmhaas.com

Date: Thu, 3 Mar 1994 04:38:54 GMT
From: netcomsv!netcom.com!tcj@decwrl.dec.com
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <199402271230.EAA06623@ucsd.edu>,
<9402281434.AA12050@umassmed.UMMED.EDU>,
<rohvm1.mah48d-010394075503@136.141.220.39>
Subject : The ARRL is a business (was "Re: ARRL--->Online Repeater directory")

Stephen Baker (sbaker@umassmed.UMMED.EDU) writes:

 > The league publishes the repeater directory which it currently
 > enjoys monopoly status. This must be enormously profitable for them
 > as they are the sole source for such a directory

John E. Taylor III (rohvm1.mah48d@rohmhaas.com) replies:

 > Enormously profitable? I don't think the League makes a _bundle_ on
 > anything. They _are_ a business, though. As others have pointed
 > out, non-profit does not mean that you can't _make_ money, it just
 > governs what you _do_ with the money you make.

A league official recently told me that the ARRL spends an average of $75 per
year per member. If I'm not mistaken, membership costs only $40. That extra
$35 per capita has to come from somewhere.

As John very correctly points out, being a non-profit organization and

generating revenue are not mututally exclusive. Although I'm neither a tax
lawyer nor an accountant, my understanding is that, excluding an allowed
accrual for operating expenses, a non-profit organization's income and
expenses must balance to zero at the end of its fiscal year.

Todd, KB6JXT

Date: 3 Mar 1994 04:09:55 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!ucsnews!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!
howland.reston.ans.net!wupost!bigfoot.wustl.edu!cec3!jlw3@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1994Mar2.070107.25919@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,
<1994Mar2.144907.26098@bongo.tele.com>, <CM2960.93I@ucdavis.edu>
Subject : Re: JARGON

Daniel D. Todd (ez006683@chip.ucdavis.edu) wrote:
: Julian Macassey (julian@bongo.tele.com) wrote:

: :   Wheras real mortals will say: "Blew a fuse this morning". A
: : true ham will spin it out with a desciption of what equipment was
: : drawing current at the time, who was effected, the duration of the
: : outage and the total milage driven to buy a new fuse. A skilled ham
: : communicator can spin a simple event out so that the description of it
: : takes three times longer than the duration of the actual event.

: Nah,
: A real Ham(tm) would have ten of the required fuses on hand but would
: still manage to use teh wrong value the first three times. He (or she)
: would then explain when and where they bought the fuse ten years ago.
: The worst part is that many other Real Hams(tm) will actually be
: interested and probably pump the first ham for more information. :-)

Now this is my question: do hams *ever* talk about anything besides what
kind of rig (s)he's got, ham problems, ham equipment, etc? As a waiting
(as in for my ticket) prospective, I've liistened to the local repeaters,
and personally, the conversations seem pretty boring if that's all you
ever talk about. Have I missed anything? or something? Is the purpose
of ham radio to talk about the technicalities of it? I know that the
whole nature of it requires technicality, but isn't there more to
it than that?

--jesse (still waiting)

Date: 3 Mar 1994 03:59:10 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!ucsnews!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!
howland.reston.ans.net!wupost!bigfoot.wustl.edu!cec3!jlw3@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <CLoxAu.96q@on.bell.ca>, <wa2iseCLqs4n.CH1@netcom.com>,
<CLzFGD.Eun@eskimo.com>e
Subject : Re: INTERNET -- PACKET gateway!!!

: While it is possible to do, my question is why? would you want to do it?
:
: After all, Ham radio is just that, Radio! Tieing it into hardlines in
: that matter seems to stray from the topic of the hobby. Pointing mainly
: at the matter of RADIO to RADIO digital communication. Thats the sport
: of things. THink about it.
: Just my opinion of course! :)
:
: R.Seacat KB7ZFU/AA

What about this situation: I'd like to keep in touch touch with non-amateur
friends, who I usually use email for. (internet) but when I'm not at college
(i.e. at home), I'd like to be able to get email. I just talked to the local
sysadmin about this, and I'd essentially be forwarding my email (pre-screened
by a program I'd have to write, of course, for length and content), to myself
in Dallas. Sound feasible? It _is _ getting past the hardline, as I dont'
always have access to the internet.

--jesse(>10 weeks and waiting)

Date: Wed, 2 Mar 1994 12:39:30 -0500
From: news.acns.nwu.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!
news.byu.edu!yvax.byu.edu!cunyvm!rohvm1!rohvm1.mah48d@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <gregg.68.000DC24B@plains.nodak.edu>, <762531813snx@skyld.grendel.com>,
<2kvqsu$r0d@ornews.intel.com>vax
Subject : Re: 5 by 5...

In article <2kvqsu$r0d@ornews.intel.com>, zardoz@ornews.intel.com (Jim
Garver) wrote:

> In article <762531813snx@skyld.grendel.com> jangus@skyld.grendel.com (Jeffrey D.
Angus) writes:
>
> >In article <gregg.68.000DC24B@plains.nodak.edu> gregg@plains.nodak.edu writes:

```
>
> >  > Where did the phrase, "I read you five by five." come from and what does
> >  > it mean.  I know it means good copy, but what specifically does it mean?
> >  > Does it come from the early days of radar, of ham radio, of military
> >  > aviation or what?
>
> >  It comes from the RST signal reporting system.
>
> I would question this.  You will never hear an air traffic controller give
> a signal report greater than 5X5.  In fact, I've never heard one give a
> report under 5X5 for that matter.  It seems to me they have 3 signal reports
> commonly used:
>
> "Taylorcraft 99999, You're 5 by 5.  Squawk 4747, transistion approved".
>
> "Aircraft calling, you're garbled and unreadable.  Remain clear of ARSA/TCA".
>
> "Aircraft calling, you're scratchy and unreadable.  Remain clear of ARSA/TCA".
>
> I've started using 5X5 myself after becoming disgusted with the abuse of 5X9.
> I used to always use 5X7 out of generosity but a more middle figure is
> probably better.  5X9 should require meter repair while 5X0 obviously means
> you only hear hiss.  Actually, "Loud and Clear" has no more syllables than
> "Five by Five" and will probably be better understood by a wider audience.

This appears to go back to military usage during WWII (maybe earlier, but
_I_ wasn't around to verify that), and a radiotelephone signal-report scale
that was 1 - 5 on both readability and strength.  Thus "5 by 5" is a good
as it gets.

Doesn't the Airman's Information Manual have something in it about signal
reports.  I seem to recall they encouraged plain-language reports, which
make sense; using "5 by 5" from the tower sounds like a non-approved
attempt at a personal "style."  Most people understand it, but also
understand "solid copy" or "loud and clear" at least as well.

--
73  de  John Taylor    W3ZID
rohvm1.mah48d@rohmhaas.com

------------------------------

Date: Wed, 2 Mar 1994 18:48:49 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!pacbell.com!sgiblab!swrinde!gatech!asuvax!
pitstop.mcd.mot.com!mcdphx!schbbs!waters.corp.mot.com.corp.mot.com!
user@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu
```

References <1994Feb27.133807.12203@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,
<rcrw90-280294091343@waters.corp.mot.com.corp.mot.com>,
<CSLE87-020394103111@145.39.1.10>
Subject : Re: On-line Repeater Directory

At the risk of killing off a good flamefest, there have been some
developments since I posted this:

In article <CSLE87-020394103111@145.39.1.10>, CSLE87 (Karl Beckman) wrote:

> In article <rcrw90-280294091343@waters.corp.mot.com.corp.mot.com>,
> rcrw90@email.mot.com (Mike Waters) wrote:

> > (1) I sure would like to see a copy of the original letter making "lawyer
> > noises".

> This has been addressed by fax from the receiver to specific requestors.

He was nice enough to send me a copy. The letter does *not* support the
allegations being made in this thread!

> > (4) Did you ever stop to think that there may even be some *other* reason
> > for objecting to misues of copyright? Like if you let one person abuse
> > your copyright then others will try and maybe get away with it on that
> > basis? I can certainly think of some crazies who would gladly abuse ARRL
> > publications fo rtheir own purposes, both to make money and to just make
> > a nuisance of themselves - we have a few examples who post to these
> > newsgroups for example.

The ARRL letter states that this is indeed the case as I suspected.

> There is also the point that the ARRL may themselves be abusing the
> copyright process and harrassing other publishers.

As the original letter clearly states, the ARRL cannot be selective in its
enforcement of Copyrights. If one infringer is allowed to copy part of
their text then others can do the same.

The basic principle of Corpyright is that you cannot copy someone else's
published work without their permission.

Asking permission to use the material would seem like a reasonable thing to
do though. I understand that this is actually in progress in one form or
another.

Enforcing your legal rights is not harrasment, however much you dislike
that enforcement.

> In fact, if a pattern
> were found,
> the League could be charged with anti-trust violations and the membership
> could potentially be charged individually with conspiracy and tried under
> the RICO statutes. Heavy stuff - is it worth the bad PR to amateur radio in
> general and the costs to ARRL in particular??

Interesting speculation. I suppose if little green men from mars were to
land in Newington becase of all the antennas at ARRL headquarters that
would create quite a stir too.

As far as I know there has been no suggestion of either possibility.

> The real issue is whether a valid claim of copyright exists at all.

Ultimately the claim is valid if a court says it is.

> The
> previous recent legal precedent says that there can be no valid copyright
> granted to ownership of the facts, merely the presentation of them (in
> the specific ARRL case, in PRINTED form). Therefore the presentation of
> a larger set of data, similar in form (and in a totally different media) is
> not subject to copyright protection. Just because Encyclopaedia Brittanica
> copyrights their encylopaedia does not mean that they have sole ownership
> of the facts presented therein. They own _their_ _presentation_ only.

The SC case that I think you are referringto says nothing whatever about
the media used. The defendant in that case did not merely copy the
information, but reordered it and added "significant originality", enough
to justify a separate copyright.

According to the ARRL letter the directory project was exactly copying
large portions of the ARRL directory, including codes for such things as PL
access which were created by ARRL. That was not the true in the SC case.

> > (I'm not a lawyer so this is not a legal opinion :-)

In case you missed this last time, in addition I am quoting the ARRL letter
this time.

> Likewise, but experience tells me that if the phone companies with all
> their legal resources LOST the US District Curt case

It was the U.S. Supreme Court

> protecting their
> claimed copyright of the contents of a telephone directory, the League
> stands precious little chance of winning, much less recouping the legal

> costs from the sale of their version of a repeater directory.

According to the ARRL letter the facts are different here. I am aware on
no law or court decisions which allow "literal copying" of any kind for
distribution.

I refuse to speculate on anyone's "chances of winning" a lawsuit :-)
--
Phooey on it all - I'm going sailing for a year or two!!!

End of Info-Hams Digest V94 #232
****
****